

09/458,369

MS126565.1

REMARKS

Claims 1-46 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. A clean version of all pending claims is found at pages 2-11. Claims 1, 14, 19, 25, 26, 33, 36, and 42 have been amended herein to incorporate limitations of claims dependent therefrom. Claim 17 has been amended to correct a minor informality. Please cancel claims 3, 4, 7, 16, 35, 40, and 43. Claim 47 is newly added. These amendments and additions emphasize novel aspects of the subject invention discussed *infra*. These claims do not raise new issues requiring further search or undue effort by the Examiner, and therefore entry and consideration thereof is respectfully requested. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection to Claim 7 Under C.F.R. §1.75(c)

Claim 7 stands objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. It is respectfully submitted that this objection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 7 has been cancelled herein, thus this objection is considered moot.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-23, 25-31, 33-40, and 42-45 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-23, 25-31, 33-40, and 42-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Golson *et al.* (U.S. 5,761,505). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Golson *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every element recited in the respective claims.

For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that "each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (*quoting Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

09/458,369

MS126565.]

The subject invention as claimed relates to a server-client system in which system configuration information for a peripheral device on a server is stored on a client. Information related to a peripheral device is stored on a client so that the configuration is automatically restored to the server or a different server upon connection. In particular, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 14, 19, 25, 33, 36, and 42) has been amended to recite that the server support configuration information is deleted from the server when the connection between the client and the server is terminated and upon establishing a new connection between the client and the server, the server support configuration information is utilized to automatically restore the server support for the peripheral device by transmitting the server support configuration information stored at the client to the server. It is readily apparent that Golson *et al.* does not teach or suggest such aspects of the applicants' claimed invention.

Golson *et al.* fails to teach or suggest that *server support configuration information is deleted from the server when the connection between the client and the server is terminated*. Instead, Golson *et al.* discloses a global resource data base stored in a global memory connected to a network. (See abstract). When a client and server disconnect, information remains stored in the global resource data base instead of being deleted from the server when the client/server connection is terminated as recited in the subject claims.

Moreover, Golson *et al.* does not teach or suggest that the *server support configuration information is utilized to automatically restore the server support for the peripheral device by transmitting the server support configuration information stored at the client to the server* as recited in the subject claims. Furthermore, Golson *et al.* does not teach or suggest *transmitting server support configuration information related to the peripheral device from the server to the client*. Golson *et al.* simply teaches transmitting configuration tasks, which are instructions to add, delete or modify a resource object. (See col. 6, ln. 56-65). Thus, at best Golson *et al.* teaches transmitting instructions to a client, rather than transmitting *server support configuration information related to the peripheral device from the server to the client*. The subject invention as claimed provides for transmitting configuration information which includes, for example,

09/458,369

MS126565.1

data associated with print drivers, printer queues, printer settings, and I/O ports to which the printer is connected. (See pg. 9, ln. 20-23).

Additionally, Golson *et al.* fails to teach or suggest *storing the transmitted server support configuration information at the client* as recited in independent claims 1, 25, 36, and 42. Instead, Golson *et al.* teaches utilizing a *global* resource data base that maintains a plurality of resource objects. (See col. 5, ln. 58-60). The *global* resource data base is contained *within the nonvolatile global memory*. (See Fig. 1). Thus, the configuration information is stored globally. The subject invention, however, stores configuration information *at the client* (locally) and, therefore, the configuration information is readily available at the client in the event that the configuration information is needed to be restored on the server. (See pg. 10, ln. 1-2).

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that Golson *et al.* does not anticipate or suggest the subject invention as recited in claims 1, 14, 19, 25, 33, 36, and 42 (and claims 2-3, 5-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-23, 26-31, 34-40, and 43-45 which respectively depend there from). This rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 1, 8, 12-14, 17, 19, 23, 25, 30, 33, 34, 36, 42, and 45 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 8, 12-14, 17, 19, 23, 25, 30, 33, 34, 36, 42, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lomas *et al.* (U.S. 6,424,424). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Lomas *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every element recited in the respective claims. In particular, independent claims 1, 14, 19, 25, 33, 36, and 42 have been amended herein to incorporate limitations from dependent claims 3, 16, 26, 35, 40, and 43. Thus, it is believed that such rejection is moot in view of the aforementioned amendments. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

09/458,369

MS126565.1

IV. Rejection of Claims 2-7, 18, 20-22, 26-29, 37-38, 40-41, and 43-44 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2-7, 18, 20-22, 26-29, 37-38, 40-41, and 43-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lomas *et al.* (U.S. 6,424,424) further in view of Yellepeddy *et al.* (U.S. 6,288,790). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Independent claims 1, 14, 19, 25, 36, and 42 (which claims 2-7, 18, 20-22, 26-29, 37-38, 40-41, and 43-44 depend from) have been amended herein and claims 3, 4, 7, 40, and 43 have been cancelled herein. Thus, it is believed that this rejection is moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claims 9, 10, 15, 16, 31, 35, and 39 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9, 10, 15, 16, 31, 35, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lomas *et al.* (U.S. 6,424,424) in view of Huang *et al.* (U.S. 6,131,134) further in view of White *et al.* (U.S. 6,301,012). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. It is believed that this rejection is moot in view of the amendments to independent claims 1, 14, 25, and 36 (which claims 9, 10, 15, 16, 31, 35, and 39 depend from) and the cancellation of claim 35. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claims 11, 24, 32, and 46 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 11, 24, 32, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lomas *et al.* (U.S. 6,424,424) in view of White *et al.* (U.S. 6,301,012). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Independent claims 1, 19, 25, and 42 (which claims 11, 24, 32, and 46 depend from) have been amended herein. Therefore, it is believed that this rejection is moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claims 1-46 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over

09/458,369

MS126565.1

Gase *et al.* (U.S. 5,580,177) in view of Urevig *et al.* (U.S. 6,154,787). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Gase *et al.* and Urevig *et al.*, alone and/or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations set forth in the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, *the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.* See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (emphasis added).

The combination of Gase *et al.* and Urevig *et al.* fail to teach or suggest that the *server support configuration information is deleted from the server when the connection between the client and the server is terminated* as recited in independent claim 1 (and similarly in independent claims 14, 19, 25, 33, 36, and 42). The Examiner's statements in the Office Action dated Nov. 11, 2003 illustrate the difference between the subject invention and the prior art. The Office Action contends that "Gase disclosed a centralized server acting to *maintain records* associated with various network printers. . . . This central server further provided printer drivers for installation at client terminals for usage of network printers." (See Office Action dated Nov. 11, 2003, pg. 11, ¶ 40) (emphasis added). Thus, in Gase *et al.*, the server *maintains records*, which provide printer drivers to a client upon connection. On the contrary, the subject invention *deletes server support configuration information* from the server.

Moreover, the combination of Gase *et al.* and Urevig *et al.* do not teach or suggest that *upon establishing a new connection between the client and the server, the server support configuration information is utilized to automatically restore the server*

09/458,369

MS126565.1

support for the peripheral device by transmitting the server support configuration information stored at the client to the server as recited in independent claim 1 (and similarly in independent claims 14, 19, 25, 33, 36, and 42). The Office Action contends that "transmitting the configuration information stored at the client to the server" is taught by "Gase, Column 1, Lines 43-46, Column 4, Lines 41-45, Urevig, Column 5, Lines 36-46." (See Office Action dated Nov. 11, 2003, pg. 13, ¶ 3). Applicants respectfully disagree with such assertions. Instead, Gase *et al.* discloses that when a new printer type is added to a site, each client must be informed and that data is accumulated within a file server. (See Gase *et al.*, col. 1, ln. 43-46; col. 4, ln. 41-45). Additionally, Urevig *et al.* fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Gase *et al.* Thus, the combination of Gase *et al.* and Urevig *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest such aspects of the claimed invention.

As discussed *supra*, claims 1, 25, 36, and 42 recite *storing the transmitted server support configuration information at the client*. It is readily apparent that neither Gase *et al.* nor Urevig *et al.* teach or suggest such aspects of the applicants' claimed invention. Gase *et al.* discloses uploading a print driver into a printer/driver library which is part of the file server. (See Fig. 1; col. 4, ln. 27-35). Thus, the print driver is stored *at the server*, instead of *at the client*. Urevig *et al.* teaches utilizing a STDM, which is a central coordinating facility. (See col. 6, ln. 27-53). Thus, Urevig *et al.* teaches storing information *at the server instead of at the client*. On the contrary, the subject invention stores the transmitted server support configuration information *at the client*. The applicants' invention facilitates restoring configuration information of a peripheral device on the server. (See pg. 10, ln. 1-5). Therefore, Gase *et al.* and Urevig *et al.* fail to teach or suggest such aspects of the applicants' claimed invention.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that Gase *et al.* and Urevig *et al.*, alone and/or in combination, do not teach, suggest or disclose the subject invention as recited in claims 1, 14, 19, 25, 33, 36, and 42 (and claims 2-13, 15-18, 20-24, 26-32, 34-35, 37-41, and 43-46 which respectively depend there from). This rejection should be withdrawn.

09/458,369

MS126565.1

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP


Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731